Table 7-1
Comparative Analysis of Groundwater Remedial Alternatives
Rolling Knolls Landfill Superfund Site
Chatham, New Jersey

	Groundwater Alternatives		
	1	**2**	**3**
1. Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment			
Human Health Protection	Does not meet NCP criterion	Meets NCP criterion	Meets NCP criterion
Environmental Protection	NA	NA	NA
2. Compliance with ARARs			
Chemical Specific ARARs	Does not meet NCP criterion	Meets NCP criterion	Meets NCP criterion
Location Specific ARARs	NA	Meets NCP criterion	Meets NCP criterion
Action Specific ARARs	NA	Meets NCP criterion	Meets NCP criterion
3. Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence			
Magnitude of Residual Risk	Poor	Good	Excellent
Adequacy and Reliability of Controls	NA	Good	Excellent
4. Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, and Volume Through Treatment			
Treatment Process used and Materials Treated	Poor	Poor	Excellent
Amount of Hazardous Materials Destroyed or Treated	Poor	Poor	Excellent
Degree of Expected Reductions in Toxicity, Mobility or Volume through Treatment	Poor	Poor	Excellent
Degree to which Treatment is Irreversible	Poor	Poor	Good
Type and Quantity of Residuals Remaining after Treatment	Poor	Poor	Good
Whether the Alternative Would Satisfy the Statutory Preference for Treatment as a Principal Element	Poor	Poor	Excellent

Table 7-1
Comparative Analysis of Groundwater Remedial Alternatives
Rolling Knolls Landfill Superfund Site
Chatham, New Jersey

	Groundwater Alternatives		
	1	2	3
5. Short-Term Effectiveness			
Protection of Community During Remedial Actions	NA	Excellent	Excellent
Protection of Workers During Remedial Actions	NA	Excellent	Excellent
Environmental Impacts	NA	Excellent	Good
Time Until Remedial Action Objectives are Achieved	Poor	Moderate	Good
6. Implementability			
Ability to Construct and Operate the Technology	NA	Excellent	Excellent
Reliability of the Technology	NA	Excellent	Excellent
Ease of Undertaking Additional Remedial Actions, if necessary	NA	Excellent	Excellent
Ability to Monitor Effectiveness of Remedy	NA	Excellent	Excellent
Ability to Obtain Approvals and Coordinate with Other Agencies	NA	Excellent	Good
Availability of Off-Site Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Services and Capacity	NA	Good	Good
Availability of Necessary Equipment and Specialists	NA	Excellent	Excellent
Availability of Prospective Technology	NA	Excellent	Excellent

Table 7-1
Comparative Analysis of Groundwater Remedial Alternatives
Rolling Knolls Landfill Superfund Site
Chatham, New Jersey

	Groundwater Alternatives		
	1	**2**	**3**
7. Costs			
Indirect Capital Cost (Design/ Construction Oversight/ Permits)	NA	$34,200	$365,600
Direct Capital Costs	NA	$115,200	$1,254,000
Post-Construction Operation, Maintenance, and Monitoring Costs	NA	$1,195,000	1,195,000
Total Costs	NA	$1,345,000	$2,815,000
8. State (or Support Agency) Acceptance	**TBE**	**TBE**	**TBE**
9. Community Acceptance	**TBE**	**TBE**	**TBE**

Notes
1. Alternative Description:
   Alternative 1 - No Action
   Alternative 2 - Source Control and Monitoring
   Alternative 3 - Source Control and Monitoring with a Contingent Remedy
2. NCP - National Contingency Plan.
3. TBE - To be evaluated. The findings from the detailed analysis of the State (or support agency) acceptance and Community acceptance criteria will be presented in ROD once USEPA completes their review of and provides comments on the final FS report.
4. NA - Not applicable.